

Cc: Fagen, Elizabeth[Fagen.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
To: Way, Steven[way.steven@epa.gov]; Griffin, Susan[Griffin.Susan@epa.gov]
From: Dhieux, Joyel
Sent: Thur 7/23/2015 10:10:20 PM
Subject: Re: Silverton Map and White Paper

Hi Susan and Liz,

I'm on response duty next week so my schedule is always likely to change at the last moment. Assuming that I am still around on Tuesday afternoon, would you like to meet to discuss the Silverton SOP? It may be a bit premature since we wouldn't have the approval from the Town yet, but it will help prepare us to move forward once we have the ok. I'm available all afternoon and would propose 1:00 pm Tuesday July 28, if that works for you all.

Joyel

.....
Joyel Dhieux
Federal On-Scene Coordinator
U.S. EPA Region 8
Tel: 303-312-6647
Cell: 720-441-9961

From: Way, Steven
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 3:58 PM
To: Griffin, Susan
Cc: Dhieux, Joyel; Fagen, Elizabeth
Subject: Re: Silverton Map and White Paper

Susan - yes the XRF analysis would be from samples/ collected and w chain of custody. We might do some insitu to make field decisions. Lab work on some percentage of those collected; if correlation is good stop, if not more lab data....

What do you want for bio-availability/ accessibly- speciation? Method ?

Thanks for your assistance

S

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 23, 2015, at 9:20 AM, Griffin, Susan <Griffin.Susan@epa.gov> wrote:

>

> Not sure if you were already off the call when we discussed this analysis. Field portable XRF is of limited application when it comes to gathering data for risk assessment and decision making. Fixed XRF is significantly better and the data more accurate. We also need to analyze a subset of the data for a full metals suite which rules out field portable XRF. So, once we get approval for sampling from the town let's discuss analytical methods, okay?

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Way, Steven

> Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 6:46 PM

> To: Griffin, Susan

> Cc: Dhieux, Joyel; Fagen, Elizabeth

> Subject: Re: Silverton Map and White Paper

>

> That s fine to include it sooner.
>
> Also, as for timing on the data for the town samples, my thought was that we would get a few lab sample results back to compare our XRF data to before reporting data to all. Any opinions
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
>> On Jul 22, 2015, at 4:08 PM, Griffin, Susan <Griffin.Susan@epa.gov> wrote:
>>
>> I'd like to include the bioaccessibility testing. Sooner or later we will need to do it.
>>
>> _____
>> From: Dhieux, Joyel
>> Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 11:22 AM
>> To: Way, Steven; Fagen, Elizabeth; Griffin, Susan
>> Subject: Silverton Map and White Paper
>>
>> Hi All,
>>
>> I've attached a revised version of the white paper. Please let me know if I've captured all of your comments and/or if you have additional comments on the revised version. One key question: We do still want a bioaccessibility test for some of the samples, right?
>>
>> I have also attached two maps. The first map shows the Town of Silverton with the smelters highlighted and the general proposed sampling locations. Please let me know if there are other locations we should add (or feel free to add them yourself in the Animas viewer). The map doesn't have the 500 foot radius around the smelters that Liz had included, should I add that back in? (Frankly, I was trying to recreate them but am not as map savvy as Liz!) Is there anything else we want to include on the map?
>>
>> The second map shows the Rose-Walsh Smelter site. While it doesn't include the sampling locations or contamination gradient, it at least shows the area that has been previously sampled. I'll keep looking for a better map to demonstrate the deposition from the Rose-Walsh Smelter.
>>
>> Thanks,
>>
>> Joyel
>>
>>
>> Joyel R. Dhieux
>> Federal On-Scene Coordinator
>> U.S. EPA Region 8
>> Ph: 303-312-6647
>> Cell: 720-441-9961
>>